

May 1951

CHILD WELFARE

JOURNAL OF

THE CHILD WELFARE LEAGUE OF AMERICA, INC.

VOLUME XXX • NUMBER 5

price 35 cents

CHILD WELFARE

JOURNAL OF THE CHILD WELFARE LEAGUE OF AMERICA, Inc.

Published Monthly except August and September, by the Child Welfare League of America

• HENRIETTA L. GORDON, Editor

ANNUAL SUBSCRIPTION \$3.00

SINGLE COPIES 35 CENTS

Child Welfare is a Forum for discussion in print of child welfare problems and the programs and skills needed to solve them. Endorsement does not necessarily go with the printing of opinions expressed over a signature.

CHECKS PAYABLE TO Child Welfare League of America, Inc.

24 West 40th Street, New York 18, N.Y.

CONTENTS

	PAGE
Long Time Foster Home Care as an Agency Service	3
Problems of a Statewide Agency	7
Editorial Comments	
Social Work Salaries	10
Must We Turn the Clock Back?	10
A Board Member Speaks	
The Outlook for Private Philanthropy	11
Readers' Forum	16
Book Notes	17
Classified Ad Service	19

COMMITTEES ON PUBLICATIONS

MRS. RICHARD L. BOWDITCH, *Board Member, Children's Aid Association, Boston, Mass.*

Policy Committee

MRS. GEORGE P. EDMONDS
E. MARGUERITE GANE

MRS. JOE HUME GARDNER
MRS. HENRY HITCHCOCK

REV. JOHN J. LENNON
SOPHIE VAN S. THEIS

Advisory Committee

SALLIE E. BRIGHT *Executive Director, National Publicity Council for Health and Welfare, New York, N. Y.*
MRS. CLEVELAND B. CHASE *Board Member, St. Christopher's School, Dobbs Ferry, N. Y.*
MRS. BERNICE W. FRECHTMAN *Head of Volunteer Services, Jewish Board of Guardians, New York, N. Y.*
DR. ROMAN L. HAREMSKI *Director, Children's Division, City of Chicago Department of Welfare, Chicago, Ill.*
DOROTHY HUTCHINSON *Professor of Social Work, New York School of Social Work, New York, N. Y.*
ADELAIDE KAISER *Director, Hillside Children's Center, Rochester, N. Y.*
FRIEDA M. KUHLMANN *Executive Secretary, Children's Aid Society, Newark, N. J.*
MARY LOIS PYLES *Consultant, U.S. Children's Bureau, Washington, D. C.*
FRED A. SCHUMACHER *Executive Director, St. Christopher's School, Dobbs Ferry, N. Y.*
VERNE WEED *Assistant Executive Director, Children's Services of Conn., Hartford, Conn.*
RUTH WEISENBARGER *Assistant Director, Sheltering Arms Children's Service, New York, N. Y.*
HELEN M. WHEELER *Director, South End Day Nursery, Boston, Mass.*

LONG TIME FOSTER HOME CARE AS AN AGENCY SERVICE

Carl Schoenberg

Supervisor, Jewish Child Care Association
New York City

The writer sets forth clearly the types of situations in which long time care is indicated and how it can be purposefully used. A discussion of some of the problems presented follows.

RECENTLY our field has been examining the number of cases in long time care, assuming long time care to mean, I believe, the growing up of a child in placement with little or no likelihood of returning to his parent during childhood. We felt that many such placements eventuated because of some one-sided emphasis in our approach. We found that where we have made mistakes or have been inattentive in maintaining equal and continuous responsibility to the needs and interests of child, foster parent and parent, cases tend to settle in the direction of the strongest combination of forces within them. We saw that without our constant activity towards balancing the interplay of factors in placement, the client who exerts most compellingly his own psychological and circumstantial demands, will tend to control the trend of the case; and as often as not, children may stay on in placement without our ever being sure whether it was necessary or advisable. We have also been expressing in conferences our frustration over the apparent lack of any alternative but long time care for some children, and over our inability to give them a legal belonging within a foster family.

It probably cannot be said too often that we must be constantly on our toes to use every opportunity and every skill to help parent and child reunite, or to help child and foster family to unite permanently, that is, by adoption, if this is possible. And in my agency we are only too aware that in many situations as we try to reach that goal we do not know if we have done everything possible to resolve the placement problem. Yet it still seems to us that within the legal and social framework of present day placement and the current levels of our skill, in certain cases long time care really is a necessary and true service for our agency to give.

Let me review briefly some of the main elements in the beginning of a placement, in order that my meanings are clear in relation to the forces which placement sets in motion. The parent who comes to us and continues with us needs regular placement for his child, since we do not offer temporary or shelter or day care. We conceive our function in foster home care to be twofold: First, to provide a whole placement service to the parent for as long as it remains a

necessary and constructive solution to his current problem; and second, to rear his child for as long as the child is with us—implying good physical care, the closest possible approximation of the normal aspects of home and community living, and the best development possible of his capacity for healthy relationships. The parent sees the agency's activity related to the child's life from the first day of placement, even in a temporary admission foster home, and he must be helped to develop a new type of limited responsibility toward his child. Actually, we extend help to him in three important ways: (1) Can he affirm, as he did a month or so ago at Intake, that placement is still the best solution to his presenting problem; (2) What are his deepest feelings toward his child; and (3) What are his capacities for organizing his direction in relation to his present separation from his child.

Child Must Find His Place

The child must transfer his dependence to the foster mother, who has come to us voluntarily, seeking psychological and social satisfactions, as well as enhancement of family income in some instances. The child must settle his questions around his foster status, and must integrate with his identity the new elements of identity which emanate from the new relationships and environment in his foster family. The foster mother, for her part, needs to strike a balance between her trust in herself as a mother and the disciplines of being a foster mother in a relationship to an agency.

As can be seen even in so sketchy a description as this, some of the essential implications and trends of long time care are implicit from the outset of placement. Others, of course, develop as placement goes on, as the child and the parent experience more of the meaning of living in placement and feel the changing which this brings. We feel that the determination of how long a placement will need to be rests ultimately upon our continuous work with the parent around the progressing meaning and use which placement has for him; but his part both acts upon and is acted upon by the meaning and use of placement for

child and foster parent. It is imperative that we as the agency be ever alert to these changes. We should see whether the parent, the child and the foster parent are moving with each step toward clearer understanding of themselves and their relationships to each other, and they must feel our central role in the realities of placement and our help all along the way.

Within this general picture, then, the cases in which long time placement is most obviously predicated, are, of course, those where there is no effective parent at all. They include the few children who come to us as full orphans for whom an adoptive home is not feasible or possible; those children who are orphaned during placement and have settled into a foster family that is unable to adopt them and from which replacement is not indicated; and the larger group of children who are legally but not socially adoptable. The latter may be physically handicapped or mentally retarded or may be possible inheritors of some disease. For some of these youngsters who come to us as babies and whose problem is marginal, we do find adoptive homes. And some of the retarded children who pull up to normal through the benefits of living for a year or so in a foster home do become adopted by these families as children who are really socially adoptable. I know, too, of one twelve-year-old whose severe physical handicaps have largely been corrected by a number of operations, and whose foster mother is planning eventual adoption. However, we have under care a definite number of surrendered but handicapped children whose foster parents are devoted to them but would have sore conflicts about adopting them, and where we would hesitate to relinquish responsibility and professional attention to people who cannot really see what difficulties the future might bring.

Children Deserted by Parents

A step removed from these children without parents are those who have been deserted by their parents because the parents do not really want them, or cannot bear any parental responsibility, or feel compelled to slam the door on their past life. These children are not surrendered—in many cases the parents have refused to surrender them—but all have been psychologically abandoned, as it were. The many differences in these situations, from one to another, make their outcome less clear than those in the first group. However, it is safe to say that in many instances the possibilities of adoption depend upon a more flexible and enlightened interpretation by the courts of what has been a traditionally circumscribed interpretation of adoption law. There has been some movement in this direction in a few cases, but until

it becomes general, most of these children must grow up in placement.

The next group of children we can consider, in moving more or less along a line from these cases where the trends indicative of need for long time care are more clear to those which are less clear, would be found in situations in which the only effective parent is institutionalized for mental or relatively chronic physical illness. Here, eventual adoption is a possibility in willing foster homes only in a few cases where it develops that the parent needs to be permanently hospitalized and is legally incompetent. The outlook in other cases depends on the remission of the parents, the degree of their health and responsibility, the meaning of the relationship between child and parent, etc. A broader approach in the legal aspects of adoption may some day allow more of these children to move into adoption; for the present, however, most of them will utilize long time care because their parents are incapacitated by illness or are institutionalized all or part of the time.

There is another group of parents who are seriously retarded mentally or limited emotionally who are simply not equal to the demands of parenthood. Many such cases come to us in New York City not on the parent's voluntary initiative, but as agency referrals or through the court as neglect adjudications. In many instances there is no questioning the strong bond between the child and the parent and its positive meaning in placement. It often turns out that such a parent is making a most commendable use of placement if he is enabled thereby to organize his life into some semblance of self-dependence or simple productivity, or even dependence on public assistance and keeping out of trouble. He sees the sustenance and advantage his child is receiving from the foster family that he himself could never hope to give, and often he is thrilled and proud at the evidence of his child's growth and accomplishment. The child, too, increasingly feels the difference between foster family and parent, yet with casework help he can create a larger life pattern which includes both parent and foster parent, while settling for himself that his place is with his foster people.

In a fifth group of more adequately functioning parents, remarriage becomes the channel to a possible discharge, often with a little too much magic attributed to it. Unfortunately, it frequently turns out to be of no help to the child in placement. The new parents may be swallowed up in more difficulties of their own, or the stepparent may refuse to accept the child, or there may be a trial discharge in which they may all prove unable to get along. Long time care remains the only viable plan, and usually the child looks to it with deeper conviction.

Most Difficult Cases

It is, however, in a final grouping of situations that most problems and questions lie—where the parent is often very much part of the placement picture, sometimes as much negatively as positively, often functioning fairly adequately, often employed—all those cases where the possible reunion of parent and child always seems so near and yet so far away. Are these not the most difficult problems which beset us and test to the utmost our skills and responsibility as placement workers?

It seems to me that part of the answer rests in the agency's continual alertness and initiative in facilitating and utilizing the strengthening forces which may emerge as the parent tries to stabilize his life during placement. The following example may illustrate this:

A young mother, who had grown up in a family dependent upon agencies, escaped into an early marriage. She was extremely fearful of both dependence and independence, yet managed to give her two children a preschool start that was not at all unsound. The breakup of the marriage forced placement, toward which she remained very ambivalent for a long time. Meanwhile, though she was moving towards a true severance of her marital relationship, she refused to live in the home that had been theirs, she made good on a job and contributed to the children's maintenance, and finally she found an apartment near their foster home. They were doing better and better in placement, but were impressed now by the evidence of a maternal home being reestablished. At the same time the mother was rapidly growing more comfortable with the prospect of the children's staying on indefinitely in their foster home, and seemed to be settling down into a new, more advanced balance of dependence and independence. At this point, the agency faced with her the further resolution of the way she could continue to use placement. The mother had, without prior discussion, stopped her payments toward the children's care when she began to furnish the apartment. She expressed great fear of thinking beyond the present, and needed to sidestep all direct discussion of her current role until the last picture was hung in her apartment, although this would mean not planning resumption of her contribution to care. The agency indicated that it would be glad to offer a suspension of her payments for a period of time within which we could together look more closely at her fearfulness and at the need of her children and herself to settle more conclusively what each had a right to expect from the other. Within a presuggested eight-month time span, marked by reactivation of great fear at first, the mother was helped to further self-mobilization in exploring the possibilities of discharge, dissipating much of her fear in planning and activity, and ended by taking the children home. The total placement period was three years and two months.

Parents' Situations Often Complex

But there are other parents who seem locked in deeper psychological ambivalences or contradictory circumstances which seem beyond our ability to affect significantly—the mother and father caught in a marriage they can neither make nor break, so that they are continually separating and coming together again; or the mother or father who likes and needs to

feel himself a parent, yet is addicted to an easy, shifting life free of parental responsibility; or a mother who had herself been placed unhappily as a child who seems emotionally unequipped for family life and perpetuates an accustomed pattern of life by keeping her own children in placement; and other situations which can be supplemented, I am sure. Here our feeling of insufficient skill can be most frustrating. Yet it is our belief that even when we exercise our best skill, as we now know it, in the effort to resolve these situations more definitively, there are still cases in which children continue to need, and are served by, indefinite foster home care.

Child Needs Sense of Belonging

I think our direction here is to demand and work continuously for the maximum clarity in the parent's relationship to the child and the agency, so that the agency can evaluate the maximum participation of the parent, and the child has the best chance to develop a clear sense of the parent's meaning to him, and what he may truly expect. This may not emerge quickly for the child, but is often an experience in time—in foster home living and in using casework help. If he is well placed, and is being helped to cope with his reality in the terms in which he can understand it and reunderstand it as he grows older, then foster care for him progresses into a long time placement which has its own inherent logic and value. For the warmth and consistency of a good foster home, together with the agency's own steadiness and help, supplies the solid footing which can enable a child to face the puzzling inconsistencies of his parent's position. If at the same time we are doing all we can to bring some order into what the parent wants from placement, then the child's growing up in his foster home has real purpose and satisfaction for him. To put the question whether the foster child can ever "really belong" may misplace the emphasis, I think. After all, genuine belonging is created in a relationship and is a product of it. The central issue is in our facilitating positive strengths for growing while moving for the greatest possible decisiveness in the parent's use of placement. Under these conditions I have seen foster children mature into a constructive independence and a permanent place in their foster families.

I would like to conclude with a little description of a typical situation of this kind:

Jean is a very pretty, rather bright girl who will be 16 in April. She is an excellent student in a commercial course and is popular with her many friends, has her steady boy friend, and in general has a full, satisfying life. She is the baby in her foster home and now the only child there. The worker says of the foster family: "I continue to be impressed with the general wholesomeness and

well-being in this foster family. The foster mother is simple, warm and sympathetic; the foster father is a jolly person who seeks his share in helping to maintain this relaxed atmosphere. The newly-married daughter is an extremely sweet person and there seems to be a lovely relationship between her and Jean.

Jean has lived in this home since the age of 3 when her mother, who was unmarried, gave up the struggle to establish a legitimate and genuine union with the father. The mother is a poorly-organized, unprepossessing person who has never seemed able to do anything right, but has kept a warm feeling for her child. She works as a waitress and disappears from contact with Jean and the agency for long periods of time, yet always turns up to see Jean once or twice, as a compass turns to the north pole, only to drift off again out of reach. We recognize her legal rights as a parent and her need to hold on to this much of her child for whatever real and symbolic meaning it has for her. More important, though, is the fact that once it became clear that this was the way the mother had to have it—beyond our ability to resolve it further—then this was the reality; to deny or distort it would help nobody.

Jean and her foster mother are very close and cannot help feeling uneasy, whenever the mother appears, about a highly unlikely but theoretically possible request for discharge on her part. The foster mother feels for the mother, however, and has been helped throughout the years to appreciate the importance of the child's need to work something out within herself, and she has been able to refrain from prejudicing the nature of the mother's visits with the child. Jean no doubt gains something from her awareness of the mother's feeling for her, although the basic need for contact stems from the mother, not Jean. Yet she understands and values the help she has received from the agency in utilizing every opportunity to develop a full sense of herself in this unavoidable real connection with a foster family and a mother. Her own inner integrity has been strengthened and deepened. This is seen in one way by the definiteness with which she retains her own name. She has feeling for her mother's plight, as a stronger toward a weaker person, and would not dream of not seeing her, but she also cannot avoid some embarrassment during their occasional contact, because of the difference between her kind of life and the standards of the mother. I think that the agency's simple affirmation of, and help with, Jean's permanent foster status, and the honesty with which Jean and her foster mother were helped to know and respect each other's feelings in their foster relationship, have reinforced their inner willingness to be together, and continually deepened their satisfaction in each other. And I think, too, that this has contributed in some ways to a truer belonging together than perhaps many children in their own families ever know.

It would sum up the current outlook of my agency on this question, then, to say that long time care is the necessary conclusion of various kinds of placements within the social and legal realities of child placement today. Our level of skill is organically related to these realities, each helping to determine and change the other. It is our responsibility to avoid errors in our work which lead to unnecessary long time placements, although knowing that with further knowledge and skill there may well be further progress in diminishing the present number of children who now have to live through childhood under the necessity of making many complicated adjustments. It is also our responsibility to carry our share of helping to relax long-standing social barriers to adoption, many of which seem so incomprehensible to

foster parents and children who are eager for a legal union. Since, however, we must daily be offering help with today's realities, it is our vital obligation to make long time care yield all its positive elements for the growth of child, parent and foster parent toward a clear sense of their interrelatedness and capacity for each other. That our best level of skill is not unequal to this test is shown, I think, by the instances in which our children have found growing up in placement a truly fruitful life beginning.

* * *

Discussion

HELEN J. COOPER

*Formerly with the Child Welfare Division of the
Board of Public Welfare, Washington, D. C.*

Mr. Schoenberg, in his paper, has very carefully and clearly delineated the characteristics of the situations of children for whom long time care has proven beneficial or for whom it has been the only alternative. All of us who have been or are concerned with agency care of children can accept the place of long time care in agency programs and can also affirm the need for a presentation such as Mr. Schoenberg has made in this paper. His analysis of these situations raises no controversial issues and the paper serves as a real "springboard" for a discussion of the problem.

One of the first questions that arises is our definition of long time care. Is time really the determining factor in this service that is so different from temporary care? Temporary care is essentially that given a child away from his own home during the period when the parent is still contemplating or working with agency help toward having the child returned to him or reaching a decision that this cannot happen. In this service, the dynamic factor of time is essential in helping the parent know his feelings and come to a decision that is right for him and the child. It would seem to me, therefore, that long time care is the service offered to the parent and child who have found their own relation to each other, with agency help, but where a plan of living together is not indicated. This may result in one of several different plans for the child. There may be total relinquishment for adoption. The child may grow up in agency foster boarding homes, maintaining a relationship with the parent, limited by the agency, where that has meaning for both parent and child, or the child may grow up in agency homes with the relationship with the parent severed, if that is indicated. Long time care may not necessarily mean one continuing foster home during the period of a child's care by the agency, but may conceivably include the use of several to meet the child's changing needs.

More Like Temporary Care

If we can accept the situation as the basis for use of long time care, it would seem that, in the case of the mother with the two children, in Mr. Schoenberg's paper, the care given those children had more of the elements of temporary care, even though the time was somewhat long.

I would like to focus on the need for agencies to take responsibility, not only in helping parent and child reunite, but also in helping them separate in a more positive way in order that long time care may be made available to them in a purposeful way rather than leaving it to chance. The latter has been one of the greatest determinants of the use of this service. It is time that we begin to examine our practice in this area and affirm our knowledge of the value of this kind of care, by using it positively.

I agree with Mr. Schoenberg that agencies need to help parent and child reunite and foster parents and child unite permanently, but the need seems even greater to examine and re-examine the value of the relationship between the child and parent and help them know it for themselves from the moment of application and all the while the child is in placement. Can the agency begin too early to help the parent know his own feelings of wanting or not wanting his child, so that a more permanent plan can be made for him and the child can be helped to live with the reality of his situation? Many children live in that uncertain state between hope and despair until they are unable to form a meaningful relationship with anyone and become a real problem to themselves and the community. Children have a right to something better than that.

Child Has Rights Too

Mr. Schoenberg recognizes the agency's responsibility to help parents clarify their relationship to the child and agency in order to help the child use this experience for the best that is in it, and yet, in this, I feel that more of the emphasis seems to be on what the parent wants from placement than on the rights of the child in this respect. Are we still letting chance play too much a part in the use of this service? In the case of Jean described in his paper, doesn't she have a right to some choice in the matter of the contacts with her mother, or do the mother's legal rights and needs supersede what the girl may really want? Is the warmth of the mother something the girl feels and wishes, and, basically, is this contact really a need of the mother's when she seeks it so seldom? We do not know these things, but I believe we need to look further at the child's feelings about placement and separation as well as those of the parents and be ready to give help and support in whichever direction they may point.

This subject cannot be considered without giving thought to the resources for long time care. From my own experience in home finding, I believe if we were able to use long time care more purposefully, we would find foster homes which would be able to give this kind of care. So many foster home applicants are unable to give up children placed for only short periods and really come to the agency looking for a child that can grow up with the family. More keen recognition of the differentiation of this service from temporary care could, in addition to the help given parent and child, make more constructive use of our foster homes.

PROBLEMS OF A STATEWIDE AGENCY

Robert M. Mulford

General Secretary, Massachusetts S. P. C. C.
Boston, Mass.

The special problems of organization, administration, financing and staffing faced by a statewide agency are thoroughly covered in this article. The statewide program is as strong as its units, says Mr. Mulford.

THE statewide agency has problems not confronted by agencies operating in compact geographical areas. This imposes upon the administrative staff responsibilities and duties which must be recognized and provided for. The Massachusetts Society for the Prevention of Cruelty to Children is a statewide agency with 19 offices in addition to its Boston or central office which serves the metropolitan Boston

area. The agency has a central board of directors, to whom the executive is responsible, and 42 boards of directors which are in reality advisory boards. Each of the 19 offices has a district board of directors associated with it and, in addition, there are some 23 branch boards of directors which represent communities surrounding the location of the district office. The executive is responsible for appointing all

personnel and supervising the total statewide program. Although the agency's function is a protective one in all its offices, some offices in addition carry child-placing, adoption, and counseling functions because other social work resources are lacking in predominantly rural areas. Although this agency's organizational structure and multiple functions offer specific problems, still there are some problems common to any statewide program.

First, as in any agency, it is important that all participants in a statewide program have a common understanding of the agency's objectives and philosophy. Staff members and board members throughout the state need to know the ways in which the agency carries out its program. They need to interpret it widely. In Massachusetts, we have been struggling to interpret adequately modern protective services as a casework function rather than a punitive prosecutory "arm-of-the-court" type of service, which many people still believe it to be. Non-protective agencies also face the difficulty of interpreting correctly their services on a statewide basis. In communities where basic casework services are not available, the agency must interpret the necessity of having such services available if the agency's primary function is to be carried out effectively. This may mean that in some communities the agency will take on additional functions. The taking on of such additional functions needs to be clearly understood as an additional program which the community needs and is willing to support adequately. The agency is then faced with interpreting not only its original function but the additional multiple functions which it has assumed.

The statewide agency is perhaps in a different position than that of the local agency in that it operates programs in both urban and rural areas, and therefore will encounter various types of communities. Some communities may be conscious of needed services and provide for them without consultation outside of the community. Others may be woefully inadequate in terms of social service resources, and the agency may find the lack of basic social services a serious obstacle to carrying on its own function. Communities too small to support several organizations, yet needing several types of services, may therefore do best to develop other services under the statewide agency's auspices. A basic requirement for developing new functions should be the ability to provide adequate staff to carry out the new program in accordance with accepted standards of service. It is obvious that before the agency can have adequate financial support and adequate personnel, the community must understand, accept, and be willing to give both moral and financial support to the specific

functions which the agency is to perform. These factors all point to the necessity for the statewide agency to continue to look at its total program and be aware of individual community differences and needs. Leadership from the Central Board and the executive staff of the statewide agency must provide clear and well-formulated descriptions of agency program and professional needs.

High Standards Must Be Maintained

A second problem which the statewide agency faces is that of maintaining high standards of operation throughout the whole area served. It is inevitable that in any program there will be varying degrees of efficiency and competence in the personnel administering the service. All staff members throughout the state will not operate at the same level. This makes it necessary for a statewide agency to interpret to local boards what constitutes high standards of service. It presents the problem of continually developing professional staff throughout the state so that a reasonable standard of service is maintained. The agency is known in any community in terms of the quality of service which that community is receiving. This makes it necessary for the statewide board and executive staff continually to maintain their position as to adequacy and competence of service. Where the state executive is responsible for hiring personnel and maintaining a uniformly high standard of service, he is in a position continually to interpret to local boards of directors their responsibility for joining with him and the state board in supporting adequate social service programs, including not only their particular agency but also the other agencies which supplement and complement the statewide agency's program.

A third problem which confronts the statewide agency is the multiplicity of responsibilities which the local staff member or executive carries. In most statewide agencies, district offices are staffed by one or more persons. In the Massachusetts S.P.C.C., 14 offices throughout the state have but one professional worker. This professional worker is first of all an administrator of our program in his area. He is responsible for giving leadership to at least one board of directors and, in some instances, as many as four. He is responsible for informing them about the amount and type of work he is doing, the way in which the board can help in interpreting and carrying out the program, and for presenting problems for social and legislative action. He has public relations responsibilities in the territory which he serves. He is responsible for developing sound interagency relationships, participating in community planning, and helping to finance the district program. In addition, his major

function is that of giving casework service. This is a sobering list of responsibilities for one person. It calls for unusual skills and personality equipment. Recruiting, training and developing such people through staff training programs and interrelated teaching methods is no small task. The statewide agency must be cognizant of its responsibility to develop personnel who can perform these tasks in an efficient manner. In some of the offices where there are additional professional staff members, the district representative is also charged with supervisory responsibility, an additional skill which he must possess or learn.

Responsibilities of Local Boards

A fourth problem has to do with the very structure of the organization and the ways in which the constituent groups perform their responsibilities. The statewide organization has a central or statewide board of directors. This board must know the overall program, must have an awareness of the needs of the whole area served, and must be responsible for reviewing organizational, financial, and policy matters. The local boards of directors must be properly constituted, and their responsibilities must be understood both by themselves and by the statewide board. As a matter of fact, many local boards of directors began as sponsoring groups whose primary function was fund-raising. The fund-raising responsibilities still remain with some of them; with others, the community chest has taken over the entire function of raising money, although local boards should play an important part in their local community chests. Many of the members of these boards had no training for responsibility other than fund-raising, and there has been a lag in interpreting the responsibility of local boards, as their function has changed from one of fund-raising to that of an advisory, policy-making function. This problem is a rather common one, encountered all over the country.

The question has frequently been raised by local advisory groups, "What is there for us to do now that the chest has taken over the financial responsibility?" The statewide program is only as strong as its units. A tragic weakness of a statewide program can be the fact that autonomy is entirely centered with the state board and state administrative staff. This can happen very easily when local boards are not aware of their responsibilities. The Massachusetts S.P.C.C. has found it helpful to set forth a list of six specific functions of local boards of directors. They are as follows:

1. To formulate policies of the local agency in its relationship with other local organizations under the general direction of the Corporate Board of Directors of the M.S.P.C.C.;

2. To suggest the type and amount of local work of the agency;
3. To approve and aid in financing the local program;
4. To carry responsibility for the work of all local committees of the M.S.P.C.C.;
5. To make suggestions to the Corporate Board of Directors in regard to policy and program as indicated by the local situation;
6. To interpret the work of the agency.

When the Central Board adopted these specific functions, our district staff people throughout the state were asked to discuss them with the local boards.

It should be emphasized that in some communities local boards will have been functioning as responsible advisory units. One is amazed at the number of responsible citizens who have for years continued as actively interested supporters of programs where they actually have had very little to do other than sit and listen. The Massachusetts S.P.C.C. has found it helpful to decentralize responsibilities which were almost entirely carried on by professional staff from the central office. The whole matter of budgeting and fund-raising was little understood by many of the local boards of directors. The development of budget committees responsible for evaluating the local agency budget was received with enthusiasm by community chests board members. The agency had very successful relationships with the community chests over a period of years, and relatively fair treatment in most of the communities. There have been instances, however, when loss of income was directly attributable to the fact that no local representatives appeared at community chest budget hearings to speak for the agency's local program. The agency required training of district staff members so that they could understand the financial and budgeting problems of the agency and be able to give leadership to the local boards.

A number of the local boards have recently created legislative committees and have given active study to legislative matters affecting children. In the last analysis, the statewide agency which has a large membership can be a potent influence affecting sound child welfare legislation. Local citizens can approach their local senators and representatives with much more effectiveness than can a professional staff member from the central office. The professional staff member can give leadership and consultation to local groups, but effective legislative activity must be undertaken by the local citizens.

A fifth problem, that of finance, is closely allied to the principles mentioned above. The financial structure of the statewide agency depends on many people. Because the operation of social agencies, like other costs, has gone up considerably, there is an increasing need for more money to be raised through bequests

(Continued on page 15)

EDITORIAL COMMENTS

Social Work Salaries

A REPORT on social work salaries issued recently by the Bureau of Labor and Statistics presents some startling figures. A nationwide and all-inclusive study revealed that actual salaries paid do not, in large measure, compare favorably to salaries paid in other professions. It also revealed that though the already high cost of living increased seven per cent after the Korean war started, what social work salary increases there were did not begin to keep pace with this upward spiral. There can be no doubt that our national mobilization effort today will place heavier and heavier demands on social service agencies in providing properly for intensified needs. Expansion of child welfare programs seems inevitable in times of growing tension when families and children face new threats to their accustomed rounds of living. They are entitled to the best service the professional field can muster, but here the salary situation constitutes a serious obstacle.

Agencies are having difficulty in filling vacancies. Schools of social work report new problems in recruiting students. Professionally trained people are finding it necessary to seek positions with more pay, not because they wish to, but for compelling financial reason.

This places an inescapable obligation on community leaders. They should recognize the dangers inherent in the situation and make every effort to correct it by bringing disproportionally low salaries into line with price levels within the limits prescribed by current legislation.

This obligation rests with the smaller communities as well as the large. The high cost of living, no respecter of professions or places, finds its way into every part of the country, into all cities and towns. Small communities can no longer argue that they cannot "compete" with large ones and therefore expect to attract staff on lower salaries because prices on a few items may be lower. On the contrary, the many advantages of living in a metropolitan area must often influence the decisions of well trained personnel and therefore competition is very real. It is only to be met by comparable if not even better salaries.

Thus everyone concerned with promoting and sustaining adequate programs of services to meet needs adequately and constructively is urged to take whatever measures are required to correct an untenable—and unnecessary—situation.

Must We Turn the Clock Back?

REPORTS of the scarcity of boarding homes for babies bring new concern for the preservation of standards. Is the scarcity produced by "these times" becoming so serious that it must stump the experts? Must agencies, in despair, and against their better judgment, turn to creating new programs of institutional care for their infants and toddlers? If this is so, the clock is indeed turning back.

Reports from leaders in the many fields allied in behalf of child welfare continue to reiterate the importance of the infant's need for individual care and attention, for the consistent, affectionate relationships to be found only in the setting of a family home. Trained nurses, close medical supervision, and handsome buildings—however modern and hygienic—do not compensate for the lack of motherly care—the *most important ingredient* in the infant formula. In "these times," with the pronouncements of the Mid-century White House Conference echoing in every part of the country, when so much depends on the development of healthy personality in coming generations, this ingredient should be preserved.

The complex problems of finding homes have been stressed time and again. They always mount in time of national stress, and we are not presuming to minimize the dilemma many communities are facing today. However, we must face the fact that by and large homefinding programs have not been given the time, attention or money necessary to their importance. Foster parents do not have the recognition that should be accorded them.

This inevitably raises some old questions frequently raised before, but with new pertinence. Do the pressures of 1951 constitute the only or most important causes of the shortages? Are agencies convinced that they have exhausted their own resources or the resources of the community in the search for homes? Are they satisfied with their methods of administering the boarding care program? How about the board rates? And the casework services? Has there been a thoroughgoing study and analysis of the comparable costs of a "first class" institutional program and a boarding home program based on renewed and expanding homefinding efforts? Has the cost of paying really adequate board rates and maintaining specialized homes, adequately subsidized, ever been computed? Are we as willing to bear the cost of first class boarding care to meet the real, the basic needs of our babies, as we are to build and maintain expensive institutions for them, knowing these needs will not be met? There are constructive uses for institutions, but the care of babies is not one of them.

Some replies to these questions would serve a useful purpose. Too much is at stake to permit us to ignore any threat to those standards we have long since fought for and long since known to be essential.

A BOARD MEMBER SPEAKS

The Outlook for Private Philanthropy

THE continued existence of private or voluntary philanthropy in England is being much more sharply threatened than is yet true in the United States. This threat has come from first, the exceedingly heavy tax burden and the consequent drying up of former sources of support; second, from extensive socialization which has taken in one service after another which was formerly rendered by private organizations. The third reason is that there are many fewer people now who have the time to devote to voluntary work. As one person expressed it,

"There are not many of us who can please ourselves as to how we divide our time between earning a living, growing delphiniums and doing volunteer work for charity."

One healthy result of this is that those interested in voluntary organizations have been forced to do some very critical thinking as to what the essential contribution of these organizations has been to the life of the community which makes it important to save them.

As I have thought about this question and tried to relate the experience of the English to our own, I have come to the following conclusions.

The first and most important one may seem simple and obvious:

That private charity must spring from the heart and understanding of the donor if it is to mean anything.

Without that leap of the heart and understanding there is nothing to distinguish our private giving from our enforced public giving through taxes.

You will note that I have stressed two elements: *first, a feeling of compassion, and second, an intelligent understanding.* I think the feeling of compassion is less frequently aroused these days than it used to be. All of us have an automatic and spontaneous feeling of pity for the person who is hungry or cold or ill. We understand that kind of suffering and respond impulsively. The fact of the matter is, though, that providing for these common human needs has been almost entirely taken over by government and is no longer within the province of private charity. This is properly so because private charity could no longer afford to meet the need. We still have in this country a good deal of private medical care, but in England since 1948 that whole field has been a responsibility of the government.

If you ask what is left for private charity to do after these common human needs have been met, I would say that there is still plenty to do, but that it requires a more refined and sophisticated kind of

compassion. (Sophistication and compassion sound wrong when put together, but I think you see what I mean.) Some of the newer ways of being poor are decidedly unattractive in their manifestations, but when we understand their causes, we can be moved to give for their relief and prevention. I can illustrate what I mean in the work of our own Society. It is a lot easier to raise money for a pair of shoes for a child than it is to secure money to pay the fee of a psychiatrist to tell us how to cure the child's neurosis even though the consequences of letting him go barefooted are far less serious in the long run than neglecting the neurosis.

The point I should like to make here is that increasingly I believe private donors are going to have to devote the same thought to your gifts that a well-run foundation does if you want to avoid the sterile and unrewarding kind of giving which merely duplicates what is already available under public auspices. I can think of no poorer reason for making a charitable gift these days than that it relieves the burden on the other taxpayers. Charitable giving should be creative and imaginative rather than futile competition with the government. This means giving to efforts to prevent social maladjustment, to research and to causes where the results may be long deferred. It also means having a wonderfully Christian forbearance for some of the subtler forms of human frailty and cussedness. Such giving need not be bleak and intellectual—it must still spring from the heart, but it means giving as much thought to your charitable investments as you do to your financial ones.

The question of federated fund raising is a highly controversial one, and I have no intention of getting into it too deeply on this occasion. I should just like to suggest that federation can be pushed so far that the donor finds himself far removed from the final object of his gift. We do not have a Community Chest in Chicago and I hope we won't, although there is considerable enthusiasm for a chest in some quarters. What we have is a Community Fund which underwrites only half of the amount which must be raised—the rest must be raised by the agencies themselves by explaining the work of the organizations and arousing people's interest in individual agencies. It is not as neat and tidy as the Community Chest scheme, nor as convenient for donors, but I think it is much sounder.

One conclusion I have come to from comparing the experience of the English with our own is that we

have got to make a serious effort to make more extensive and more intelligent use of volunteers. I would say that the services rendered by private social agencies in the United States are on the whole of better quality than those provided by private organizations in England. The principal reason our services have been better is that we usually have better trained personnel. With a well-trained professional staff there is frequently little for the interested lay person to do but raise money for the organization. Professionalization of social work has proceeded much more slowly in England than it has in the United States, with the result that much more use is made of volunteer workers. Although the services are not as good, the lay constituency has a better understanding of the work of the organizations—and more convictions about it—from having helped firsthand with it.

I am a firm believer in professional training for social workers, and I am not suggesting that we should let unskilled amateurs try their hands with the complicated kinds of cases that are coming to our private agencies today. Further, I think private social agencies *must* stand for services of high quality. I am concerned, though, over the fact that there seem to be fewer opportunities for board members and the lay constituencies of our charities to participate in more interesting and direct ways in the work of the agencies.

If the real heart of private welfare work that sets it off from state social services is the participation of the average citizen, then I think we must tackle the problem of the widening gulf between the professional practitioner and the lay citizen. The dilemma is that as our private welfare services have gotten better (as we want them to), there is a tendency for them to become more remote from the lay board members or supporters. Miss Wildy tells me that she is concerned about this, too, and that she and her staff have been giving serious thought to ways in which we can make some effective use of volunteers, particularly the younger people who need to have some firsthand acquaintance with what we do.

Maybe it would be possible to arrange some classes for young husbands and wives on the hard problems of private philanthropy today. There are far too many young women who have no real understanding or convictions about the organization they give benefits for, and many of the young husbands only attend the benefits to please their wives. Private charity won't last long on the slender understanding and convictions that some of our young people have about it today.

JAMES BROWN IV

Executive Director, Chicago Community Trust

NEWS FROM THE FIELD

An Experimental Program for Unmarried Mothers

Mr. Hall describes an interesting experiment in providing services to unmarried mothers whose needs have hitherto been unmet. We shall welcome discussion in these columns of the questions he raises.

THE experimental program conducted by the Washington Children's Home Society stemmed from the recognition of a need rather than from any philosophic concept. In Seattle it has long been apparent that more adequate service for unmarried mothers was needed. Before our program started, in the non-sectarian field, there was only the Florence Crittenton Home, together with a certain amount of counseling service by the Family Society. The latter used occasional advertising in the daily papers. For two or three years a committee representing various interested agencies held occasional meetings to study the need and to try to plan better and additional facilities. About two years ago the Washington Children's Home Society was in a position to offer the services of a qualified staff member to undertake an experiment in a type of program which was new here. The Council of Social Agencies approved this on a "demonstration" basis. It still has this status and has been helped from time to time by modest appropriations from the Seattle Community Chest. The program has been operated with the help of an advisory committee of the Council of Social Agencies on which various interested agencies were represented. The focus of the program has been the unmarried mothers who have been getting into the hands of the commercial, exploitive maternity homes, and also unmarried mothers whose children were being placed by physicians.

The Washington Children's Home Society placed the following blind advertisement in the personal column of the classified advertising sections of the *Seattle Post Intelligencer* and the *Seattle Times*:

"MATERNITY Care for Unmarried Mothers. Including Doctor, Hospital and Living Arrangements. Confidential. Plaza 8844 weekdays."

The Society offers to the unmarried mother, or the married mother illegitimately pregnant, living arrangements in her own home or the home of relatives with whom she may elect to live or in carefully investigated, approved and licensed foster homes. In cases where group residence seems desirable for the mother or represents her preference, the Society refers her to the Florence Crittenton Home in Seattle, the White Shield Home in Tacoma or Booth Memorial in Spokane.

Support in the mother's own or relatives' home or foster home is offered prior to delivery and for one

month after delivery or longer if necessary. The mother or her relatives contribute according to their resources.

The Society offers complete medical care. If the mother does not have her own physician, the Society furnishes the services of one. A panel of twelve Seattle obstetricians is serving in this capacity. If the mother has a physician, the Society compensates him at the agreed rate and defrays the actual hospital costs.

Prenatal care includes an examination of the mother every three weeks until the last month, then every week until delivery. The Society furnishes all vitamins, drugs and medical supplies prescribed by the physician. Delivery takes place in a private hospital which affords proper seclusion and protection to the mother and her child. If there are no complications, the mother is hospitalized for five or six days. The doctor's fee covers postpartum care for three months following delivery.

Complete casework service is given to the mother to aid her in the solution of her immediate problems and to help her plan for her own future and that of her child, whether she keeps her baby or relinquishes him for adoption. The final plan for the baby is made after the baby is born and the mother has recovered her strength and vigor.

During the entire time the mother is in its care, the Society furnishes her with clothing and transportation, if necessary, and gives her a small allowance for her personal needs if she is without resources.

The program actually got started in August, 1949, and after six months the Council of Social Agencies reported on it as follows:

"Ways in Which this Program is Distinctive from Other Services Offered to the Unmarried Mother in this Community."

"1. ADVERTISING OF SERVICE IN DAILY NEWSPAPERS

"This is the only complete service to unmarried mothers which has been advertised in the newspapers in an effort to reach those girls who otherwise would not have sought the help of a social agency. It was this aim which caused the Committee to have the first series of advertisements unidentified.

"2. LIVING ARRANGEMENTS

"This is the only private, nonsectarian agency which uses licensed boarding homes for unmarried mothers needing placement. This has been particularly helpful in making plans with young women beyond school age who would find group living unpleasant.

"3. MEDICAL SERVICES OFFERED

"It is the only private agency program in which funds are available to pay a doctor of the girl's own choice when the doctor will accept the agency's rate. This has been helpful where a girl has already established a good relationship with a doctor from whom she wishes to continue to receive medical care. Also it is felt that this aspect of the program will make it usable by doctors who have the problem of financing medical care for unmarried mothers com-

ing to them and, before this service was available, could solve this problem only by seeking prospective adoptive parents to pay the medical and hospital costs.

"4. COMPLETENESS OF SERVICE

"This is the only nonsectarian agency offering casework service to the unmarried mother from the time she seeks help prior to the birth of her child, through the period of the actual placement of her child for adoption when this is also needed.

"5. FLEXIBILITY OF PROGRAM

"As contrasted to services given in an institutional setting, the services offered by this agency are helpful in cases where the mother does not need complete care. In some cases the mother has made her own satisfactory living arrangements and wishes only medical and hospital care. As pointed out above, she may have arranged for medical care and need only financial help and casework service in working through plans for her child."

A good many people think that work for unmarried mothers should be conducted by a separate agency rather than as part of the program of a children's agency. It is quite possible that our present program will be merged eventually with a community program for unmarried mothers, including the present work of the Florence Crittenton Home. The agency is not so much concerned with who does the work as that it should get done. However, we see certain definite advantages in having a children's agency handle this type of program for unmarried mothers.

There is an advantage to the mother in having to form only one casework relationship. If she gives up her child, she has greater confidence in the agency's service to her child because she herself has received and used its service. There is an advantage both to the child and the agency in knowing the mother well when it comes to planning the adoptive placement. There is nothing that the separate unmarried mothers' agency can offer which cannot equally be offered by a children's agency, assuming it has the resources.

From a practical standpoint, a statewide children's agency such as ours which is well known throughout the state offers many advantages in case finding and case referrals. For example, we are able to use various resources for unmarried mothers in Spokane, Tacoma, or Vancouver, Washington, just as well as in Seattle, since we have branches in all of these places. This is important because unmarried mothers very frequently prefer to have care and treatment outside their home communities. There is no single agency in any one city which can in any degree match this spread of potential resources.

Probably some of the misgivings about a child-placing agency giving service to unmarried mothers derive from the fear that the focus of the agency's attention will be on the child rather than the mother. This possible danger can be avoided by having a separate department or staff working exclusively with

unmarried mothers, and this has been our practice. We have been able to afford only one worker for this job, but she has had no other responsibilities in the agency and no one else has shared this responsibility. We have kept the caseload of unmarried mothers down to the number that she could adequately carry. Our placement workers have no function with respect to the unmarried mother until and unless the child is released for adoption. At this point the children come into their caseloads just as though they came from another agency.

Since the program's beginning in September, 1949, 61 unmarried mothers have been received and given service. The advertisement has actually been run for only about twelve weeks of the entire period, since it produces results which soon swamp available resources.

Sixty-five per cent of the mothers are in the age range from 18 to 25 and 30% from 26 to 40. Only 5% were under 18. For this younger group, referrals are commonly made to institutional agencies. To date, two-thirds of the mothers have relinquished their children for adoption and one-third have kept them or made other plans for them.

Cooperation with Seattle physicians has produced interesting results, especially in the way of better understanding of the program on the part of the doctors and their increasing cooperation with it. A growing number of referrals are coming from physicians. At present, about an equal number of referrals in response to the advertisement, are coming from other agencies and from doctors or clinics.

The experiment has led us to believe that, given more adequate resources, we could make a considerable dent in this state on the problem of unmarried mothers who now get into the wrong hands and who are encouraged and indeed obliged to give up their babies in order to pay the freight. The question as to who should do the work, it seems to us, should be settled not so much on a philosophical basis as on a practical one. Who is in a position to do the job and who can provide the best service on the widest scale to meet the greatest need? This is the *real* question.

JOHN F. HALL

*State Director, Washington Children's Home Society
Seattle, Washington*

Public Welfare Fellowship Offered

A public welfare fellowship of \$1500 for the academic year 1951-52 is offered by the national Delta Gamma fraternity in honor of Hazel Vandenberg (Mrs. Arthur H.), who was a member of Delta Gamma as a student at the University of Michigan.

This fellowship is open to any woman graduate of an accredited American college or university and may be used at any approved school of social work. The fellowship will be awarded in June, 1951, by a committee of five Delta Gamma alumnae including Mrs. Paul V. Cottingham, chairman, Mrs. Sidney G. Hacker, secretary, and Miss Edith Abbott of the University of Chicago. Two members of the Federal Security Agency will serve as consultants. Applications should be filed not later than May 30, 1951.

Application blanks may be obtained from Mrs. Cottingham, 5111 Hamilton St., Omaha, Nebraska.

CONFERENCES

The New England Regional Conference will be held May 28 and 29, 1951, at Portsmouth, New Hampshire. Headquarters will be the Hotel Wentworth-by-the-Sea. Mr. Robert M. Mulford, General Director, Massachusetts Society for the Prevention of Cruelty to Children, Boston, is chairman.

The Midwest Regional Conference will be held at Milwaukee, Wisconsin, June 21, 22, 23, 1951. Headquarters will be the Hotel Schroeder. Mr. Fred Delli-Quadri, Director, Division of Child Welfare and Youth Service, Wisconsin State Department of Public Welfare, is chairman.

The National Conference of Social Work will be held May 13-18, 1951, in Atlantic City. The League's headquarters will be at the Hotel Traymore. The program chairman is Miss Janice Bowen, Executive Director, Child and Family Service, Portland, Maine. The co-chairman is Miss Marie C. Smith, Director, Child Welfare Division, Colorado State Department of Public Welfare, Denver, Colorado.

CURRENT ARTICLES OF INTEREST

Reprints of "The Effects of Extreme Deprivation in Infancy on Psychic Structure in Adolescence," a study by Dr. David Beres and Dr. Samuel J. Obers which appeared in *The Psychoanalytic Study of the Child*, Vol. V., may be obtained from the Jewish Child Care Association of New York, 1646 York Avenue, New York City. The price is \$.50 each.

* * *

"Child Care in Germany," an article by Gunnar Dybwad, Supervisor, Children's Division, Michigan State Department of Social Welfare, appeared in the March, 1951, issue of *The Survey*. Mr. Dybwad has twice visited Germany as consultant on child welfare to American Occupation authorities.

PROBLEMS OF A STATEWIDE AGENCY

(Continued from page 9)

and gifts, community chests, and other methods. Part of the financial structure of the Massachusetts S.P.C.C. consists of approximately 100 town committees located in areas not covered by community chests. Staff assistance to these town committees cannot very well come from the district staff person, who is already more than busy with his other responsibilities. The central office therefore provides staff service to town committees, and it has been learned from experience that there must be a continuing personal contact if the fund-raising is to reach desired goals. Reorganization of old town committees and establishment of new ones, as well as continued service to well-organized and efficiently functioning committees, is a continual process which has been found to produce favorable financial returns.

Pride in Paying Their Share

If the central statewide organization is a deficit-financing one, there is always the danger that over-centralization of responsibility may weaken the constituent subsidiaries. When district boards of directors have a full knowledge of the financial affairs of the agency, they develop pride in meeting local expenses from local funds. This does not discount the importance of sustaining the statewide organization willing to support the service in areas where the need is great and the income insufficient to meet the expense. The statewide organization, then, in relation to financial matters, needs to secure active participation and understanding of what is involved in its role as a deficit-financing agency. This inevitably means that some areas will be able to raise more than enough to support the services locally, so that they may help to carry the burden for less financially stable areas.

In relation to cost of administrative services, the statewide agency has a distinct problem. It needs to interpret to local communities the value of supervisory and consultative service as well as direct operations which help to guarantee adequate services on a statewide basis. Fixing a formula to pay for administrative costs presents a real problem, and one which needs to be worked out carefully with local approval. The matter of sharing administrative costs by local districts was considered by board members representing many of the districts at one of the All-Directors' meetings which are held annually by the Massachusetts S.P.C.C. All factors were discussed, interpreted and sharing was accepted as a sound principle. In some instances, the agency has already

been able to secure acceptance of local responsibility for supporting a fair share of the administrative cost. In the realm of financing, bequests which produce income for operating expenses are an important financial consideration. The Massachusetts S.P.C.C. has made it a practice for many years to allocate income from bequests according to the locality from which the bequest was received. Thus, persons particularly interested in the work of a certain district office, who make provisions for the Society in their wills, have the assurance that the income will be used to help carry the expense of that office, whether or not this is specifically designated in the will. This, of course, gives impetus for local board personnel to stimulate inclusion of the Society in local wills and has no doubt had a real influence in the continuing flow of bequests.

A sixth problem relates to staffing of a statewide agency. The matter of providing adequately trained and experienced staff to carry on a statewide program is a difficult one. The Massachusetts S.P.C.C. has for years depended primarily on its central or Boston office for experienced trained staff in the 19 district offices. This means that a stable staff must be available to carry on the agency's work in the central metropolitan area and that people must also be available for immediate transfer to district offices. Such an arrangement imposes strict limitations in regard to hiring personnel. In employing casework staff for the metropolitan office, we must insist upon persons being willing to accept district assignments when vacancies occur. This in turn means that when staff members are hired, consideration must be given not only to their ability as caseworkers, but also to their potentialities for district responsibility. The difficulty which the statewide agency faces here is that there may be many applications for employment in the central metropolitan office, but few people willing to accept assignment outside the metropolitan area. This has caused a real problem in the staffing of Massachusetts S.P.C.C. district offices. District boards need to know about this difficulty so that they will understand delays in replacements. They also need adequate interpretation in regard to the necessity for personnel with high educational and appropriate personality qualifications.

Importance of Supervision

The final problem which needs mention is how to maintain a uniformly high plane of service throughout the state. Obviously this is accomplished through supervisory and consultative personnel. The casework program and its adequacy may directly rest

with the quality of supervision the district personnel receive. Only as there is a regularly scheduled supervisory conference for district personnel can the agency hope to maintain high standards on any uniform level. The statewide agency needs to have a clear concept of what constitutes supervision. If field supervisory staff are put in the position of being a "checking, snooping corps," there is a likelihood that there will be only resentment and distrust of the central administrative staff. In addition to supervisory responsibilities, the statewide agency must be able to provide skilled consultation for its district staff and directors. There needs to be a close liaison between the district boards of directors and the central administrative office and central board. This can be achieved only when there is planned regular consultation and exchange of ideas.

One of the advantages of the statewide agency is that it can carry on certain activities much more economically over a large territory than if each local office were to carry on these functions for itself. Public relations, bookkeeping, purchasing, and staff service to local fund-raising groups are examples of these services. Methods of social action, comparing experiences in various localities in relation to community needs, can be shared through the statewide administrative field staff. We have found that many of the irritating misunderstandings which inevitably occur in any statewide program can best be handled when there is quick consultation on the spot. Appreciation of the advantages of the statewide organization are further evident when an active field staff is in touch with local personnel.

The matter of representation from all over the state on the central board of directors is another means for increasing the feeling of joint participation. There are several ways in which statewide agencies may provide for this local representation. It may be impossible for each locality to be directly represented on a small executive committee or central board. As a matter of fact, the Massachusetts S.P.C.C. has representatives of over half of its district and branch boards on its central board of directors. However, every district and branch board is represented in the corporate membership, and receive the various bulletins and public relations material so that they may keep in close touch with the work of the agency.

The foregoing comments in relation to holding the statewide agency together all emphasize the fact that public relations is something which must be carried on inside as well as outside the agency. All personnel, board and staff, need to be kept informed about the purpose and function of local and statewide operations if there is to be a strong unified statewide program.

READERS' FORUM

Boarding Care for Babies

In connection with the editorial on page 10, we are glad to present the following statements from a prominent New York pediatrician, Dr. Frederick C. Hunt, which add their own evidence on the results of using properly selected and properly serviced boarding homes for babies. Dr. Hunt has had an unusual opportunity to observe the advantages of the two systems of care. He was in charge of the Alice Chapin Nursery in New York City from 1927 to 1943. When the Nursery was closed in 1946, he followed the babies' progress in boarding homes, and in the last four and a half years has seen almost as many babies as he did during his many years of service at the Nursery.

CHILD WELFARE would welcome comments on these statements as well as additional discussion on the question of infant care and the care of pre-school children.

Dear Editor:

... It has been my privilege for a number of years to observe both forms of care (nursery and foster home care). For a number of years, you will remember, the Chapin Adoption Service maintained a nursery on West 22nd Street, which was closed with its amalgamation with the Spence Service, and the children were placed in boarding homes.

I feel that there has been considerably less acute illness of the infants since we have been using foster home care. It is my impression also that the infants show better mental and physical development in the foster homes than in the nursery. Certainly acute illnesses are less frequent, and when they do occur, they are more easily handled and health is regained more quickly than when infants are taken care of in the nursery.

The problem of cross infection has also been reduced to a minimum, whereas with nursery care, not infrequently if one child becomes sick, even with the best attempts at isolation, the infection passes rapidly throughout the nursery. I believe that because of this factor alone, fewer children have to be hospitalized now that we are using foster home care.

The motherly care given by a foster mother is certainly preferable to the care a nurse can give to a child during a busy day in the nursery. The individual handling that babies get brings out their particular characteristics and, therefore, they do not give the impression of sameness and fall into one pattern. The boarding home offers greater opportunity for stimulation, for the members of the family all enjoy playing with the baby. The baby also has greater freedom of activity, and is allowed to get about on the floor. Less attention is paid to weight, height and color, and more to his responses.

These are but a few of the advantages which I believe are offered by boarding care rather than by grouping the children in the nursery.

FREDERICK C. HUNT, M.D.

BOOK NOTES

LOVE IS NOT ENOUGH, by Bruno Bettelheim. The Free Press, Glencoe, Ill. 1950. \$4.50.

Dr. Bettelheim has placed under a microscope for us the total life activities and therapeutic handling of the emotionally disturbed child in one laboratory setting. We are able to see the meaning and values of symptomatic behavior and pathological phenomena in these children and the steps in their re-education. He has made a distinctive contribution to the fields of residential treatment and child care, in one of the first complete laboratory descriptions of the therapeutic process as contained not in the usual psychotherapeutic approach to the individual, but in what might best be termed, an environmental or milieu treatment. However, what Dr. Bettelheim describes is more than merely milieu treatment, for he aims at an amalgamation of the group and the individual approach to disturbed children in a living situation. He has set down many of the principles of group work, group therapy, education and recreation, and even child rearing as they have been coordinated with psychoanalytic understanding.

There are many and varied residential treatment programs, which have grown from different orientations, have varying structures, and are directed from several points of view. We know little about them, and it is important that we have documents like this to augment our understanding of existing services and to develop further this type of service. The present studies of the Children's Bureau and the Child Welfare League of America, both of which are engaged in examinations of residential treatment programs, should define and classify the agencies in the field.

Dr. Bettelheim's concept of the use of all the life activities of the child as the nucleus of re-education and therapy, rather than as a milieu within which therapy takes place, or as an ancillary therapeutic tool, is a valuable, but also provocative one. In its direct application and further development of Aichorn's basic re-educational concepts, from which most of our modern methods of treatment of delinquent and disturbed children stem, he has perhaps gone to an extreme with which many in the field would not agree completely. Some would question the premise that all of the child's activities should be so prescribed in a seemingly "antiseptic" atmosphere. Questions might also be raised about the atmosphere of permissiveness with implication of a high degree of freedom for regressive patterns.

In residential treatment programs it is generally agreed that the reliving of experiences provided in the therapeutic management of all the child's life activities and relationships helps him retrace his development of life patterns. These are reflected in the earliest and most infantile experiences of eating, sleeping, bodily care, etc., thus helping the child toward a more normal mode of living and helping him to integrate a healthier pattern of growth, a sense of self, and less disturbed interpersonal relationships. However, from our experience in the re-education of maladjusted, emotionally disturbed youngsters, we would seriously question whether one can reproduce,

even symbolically, the type of earliest life experiences of which he was deprived. Life experiences can be therapeutically managed so that the child is presented with a reality that reproduces the world he comes from, but the stresses and strains are filtered down and applied in doses he is able to assimilate. All children are in the process of growth. As the deviant and retarded areas of personality are restored to health, exposure to mores and standards of behavior must go hand-in-hand with the therapeutic process. The book does not give the impression that reality is too clearly brought home to children. The child with a reading disability stemming from emotional conflicts, finally cured of his emotional problem, may in adolescence still be illiterate unless education has gone on concomitantly with therapy. In the same way, education for reality in the broadest sense should be the backdrop for the therapeutically-managed activities of the child. The book, perhaps unfairly to the program, often gives the impression that life in the school is unrelated to the realities the child must eventually face when he leaves the School. While such an atmosphere should be maintained in the interviewing room in individual psychotherapy (though even there it is circumscribed in not permitting attacks on the person of the therapist), its wider extension to the total living situation is problematic. The need to modify the environment in accordance with the needs of the patient is plain, but the child must find a place within the framework of reality which can be related to the healthier aspects of his personality.

This is particularly true with disturbed children, who are in the process of developing their egos and particularly the ability to inhibit and repress. Children during this period often look for external controls and may become panic-stricken when the meaningful people in their environment do not provide such controls. There is much that is positive and growth-producing in control and restraint. It seems to me that Dr. Bettelheim describes a program wherein the earthiness of living is too often diluted.

Psychotherapy is utilized in the Orthogenic School program, but the book does not make its place clear, does not describe the weight given to it as a treatment tool. One would have liked more discussion of psychotherapy, of the therapists themselves and of the process of staff training for therapy.

Some might disagree with the author's apparent belief that the school should not take responsibility for children after they leave. Some schools of residential treatment hold that with some children their objectives are only partially achieved in residence, and that continued treatment by the same therapist after the child leaves is important.

Many, of course, will disagree with Dr. Bettelheim's strong conviction that married couples, as parent figures, are not desirable in a resident setting. There are equally as sound arguments for both a mother and a father person as those Dr. Bettelheim advances for single counselors. At least there is no one "right way" in this.

Dr. Bettelheim's chapter, "The Challenge of Learning," should be of interest to all in the field of child development and education, and much can be learned

from his description of the tortuous process of learning in these children which can well be applied in larger group settings, and elements of which can be used in the regular classroom. Such a program as Dr. Bettelheim describes can, of course, only take place in a small setting with relatively few children and a coordinated staff. However, his experiences contain a wealth of material that all of us can apply to some degree in larger organizations.

Regrettably Dr. Bettelheim does not discuss the question of costs; one wonders if such a program is feasible for the average community. Experimental programs must show ways to make the service available at a cost that the community can bear.

Such programs as Dr. Bettelheim describes are important in themselves because the children otherwise might be lost to society. How effective the programs are, how the children finally adjust in society, how much other forces contribute to their adjustment (as they did to their maladjustment) are subjects for a good deal of further study. This book will remain a pioneer and a basic reference in the field.

NORMAN V. LOURIE

Director, Hawthorne Cedar Knolls School, Hawthorne, N. Y.

COMMUNITY TRUSTS OF AMERICA—1914–1950, by Frank D. Loomis.

The National Committee on Foundations and Trusts for Community Welfare, Chicago, Ill. 1950. 52 pp. \$1.00.

In the foreword, Edward L. Ryerson, Chairman, states that the purpose of the National Committee, "and of this little book, is to stimulate the thinking of local community chests, welfare councils, community trusts, other foundations, national and local agencies and citizens; to furnish a medium for the exchange of experience and to aid in constructive action as this may be possible and desired." In carrying out this purpose, Frank D. Loomis, Executive Director of the Chicago Community Trust from 1919 to 1949, who served as the Committee's Secretary, has brought together illuminating data on the origin and growth of community trusts from 1914 through 1949; "cardinal principles and salient features," beginning with those developed by Frederick Goff, Cleveland banker and philanthropist, who founded the first community trust; and a chapter on how these principles work out in action.

In the period between 1914 and the end of 1949, the National Committee finds, 90 trusts were set up. Of these, 76 have acquired active capital, that is, capital of which the net income, at least, is available for welfare uses. In 1949, they had aggregate capital of just under \$87,150,000. Geographically, the North Central States, including Ohio and Michigan, led with some 30 active trusts and total active capital of approximately \$30,600,000. Disbursements for charitable purposes reported by 64 amounted in 1949 to \$4,037,000.

Not quite half of the total number of trusts have executive officers directly responsible to distribution committees. Of these, 9 are full-time executives, 3 are part-time, and 29 are volunteers. Distribution committees, found in most community trusts, carry chief responsibility for decisions on uses to which funds are put, except in cases where—and the proportion of these is considerable—gifts are strictly for designated

institutions. The report points out the strategic need here of a group of "strong, representative, highly-esteemed citizens broadly experienced in welfare work."

The report also observes that community planning for social welfare will never be well-rounded or comprehensive until it includes not only the uses to be made of funds for current needs, but also planning for capital gifts and bequests; and adds that "in advising prospective donors it is the custom and policy of many community trusts to recommend that foundation trustees be given broad powers or discretion in the use of capital as well as income, but without requirement that the capital be expended within any specified time." The further observation is made "that distribution of capital by a foundation is generally regarded by the public at large with warm approval."

On the subject of designated funds, data are presented showing the differentiation made in the first community trusts having full-time executives—and presumably the largest. Of their total capital, only 13% is "designated" for the benefit of specific institutions named by the founders; something over 30% is designated as to purpose but allows distribution committees to select the beneficiaries; and 56% is for general purposes wholly in the discretion of these committees. The comment of the report in this connection is of interest: "General funds tend to be used for the equalization of community trust contributions among important services and agencies and for purposes not otherwise provided for in community trust funds; to encourage improvement in agencies which need to be strengthened; for research and experimentation in the development of new services."

Various tables are presented showing the distribution of income among six broad areas of service. In one of the most indicative, children's service comes off third in the list, with \$3,319,000, or 15%, of a total of \$21,781,000 distributed by nine major trusts from their dates of origin through 1949. The other two are hospitals and health, with 27% and education, with 16%. As children's services are not defined, children may also have benefitted in the 14% which went to neighborhood service and the 12% to family service.

The volume includes a brief statement on "standards for an acceptable community trust," which at the same time goes far toward a good definition of the community chest idea. It also contains 8 compact appendices: one listing members of the National Committee, and others giving sample resolutions creating local foundations, selections from charters, and policy statements adopted and in use. Finally a good selected bibliography and a few illustrations of how not to fetter future grant-making boards or committees—some of the cases bordering on the humorous, if their results and the untangling of their legal restrictions were not so tragic.

The Committee seems to this reviewer to have done a timely piece of work, adding helpfully to the body of data available on local endowments, trusts and foundations.

SHELBY M. HARRISON

Board Member, Child Welfare League of America